

6609 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and other publications emanating from the Soviet Union did you become aware of an internal conflict within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union some time during the second half of the 1930's?

A. During 1936 into 1938 the Government of the Soviet Union conducted several trials of formerly outstanding leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In the first trial two of the prominent defendants were Kamenev and Zinoviev. In the second trial among the prominent former leaders of the Party were Sokolnikov, Serebriakov and Piatakov. In the third trial among the outstanding former leaders were Bukharin, Rykov, Yagoda, Krestinsky, and Rokovsky.

Kamenev had been the Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars. Zinoviev had been the second secretary-general of the Communist International. The others had all held prominent positions in the Government and the Party in the Soviet Union. Yagoda had been the head of the political police for a number of years. Krestinsky had been vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs. Rokovsky had been ambassador to Paris, and so forth. Bukharin had been regarded by Lenin—

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

6612 In these trials the defendants were accused of being traitors to the Soviet Union, of being the agents of foreign powers, of becoming spies and agents of Fascism, of conspiring to plan the defeat of the Soviet Union, and to dismember Soviet territory. They were also denounced as wreckers and murderers and saboteurs.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, can you identify the publication known as Pravda? A. Yes. Pravda is the official organ of the

Central Committee and the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Government. Its editor is appointed and removed by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is therefore the most authoritative organ of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you an issue of Pravda marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit 172.

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 172.)

6613 Q. Dr. Mosely, did the Soviet Government adopt an official view or attitude toward the trial of these defendants? A. It did. The Soviet Government upheld in every particular the indictments which were brought against the defendants.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you this issue of Pravda for January 27, 1937, the article "Terrible Waves of National Ire and Hatred," and ask you if you ever read this article. A. Yes, I read it in Pravda in Russian shortly after it was published, and I have re-read it since in Russian and in English. I have also read the full published testimony as printed by the Soviet Government on each of the three trials.

Q. May I ask you, Dr. Mosely, whether in your opinion this article in Pravda reflects the attitude or the position of the Soviet Union toward these trials that you
6614 have mentioned?

THE WITNESS: Yes, in my opinion it does. It repeats the principal accusations in even more vehement language, and while the trial was still proceeding on January 27, 1937 it demanded the conviction of the defendants. It entertained no doubt whatever concerning their guilt in advance of the finding of the Soviet Court.

Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the materials and publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to what the attitude and views of that party were toward these trials that you have mentioned? A. Yes, I have.

6615 THE WITNESS: Through its official publications the Communist Party in the United States upheld in every respect the accusations brought in the trials in Moscow, upheld fully the procedure followed in the trials, and also the sentences which were imposed. Its presentation of and defense of the trials and their conduct was parallel to those presented in the Soviet press.

6617 By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would also like to ask you whether in arriving at your opinion as to the official attitude of the Soviet Government toward the so-called purge trials you also took into consideration an issue of Pravda for January 30, 1937, and specifically an article entitled "The Sentence of the Court is the Voice of the People."

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 173.)

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did take this into account. It is a leading article in Pravda, the official party newspaper, published immediately after the conclusion of the trial of January 1937.

In my opinion it represents the opinion of the Soviet Government concerning the trial and interpretation which it gave, including its interpretation of the foreign policy aspects of the trial and charges that were presented there.

6618

MR. LENVIN: I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit 174 and Petitioner's Exhibit 175 for identification.

Q. I show you exhibit 174 and I draw your attention to the article appearing commencing on the bottom of the first page of the Daily Worker, and Petitioner's Exhibit 175, an article appearing in The Communist for March 1937, and the article by I. Amter entitled "The Trial of Trotskyite Agents of Fascism," and ask you whether you have ever read those two articles before. A. Yes, I have. I read them at the time and have read them again since. I took these materials into account in forming my opinion concerning what constitutes the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward these events and trials in the Soviet Union. The press publications of the Communist Party of the United States supported completely the charges which were brought in Moscow, expressed its approval of the procedure and conduct of the trials, attacked bitterly all those who criticized either the procedure or the substance of the trials and concurred completely in the opinions expressed in the Soviet Press concerning the nature and significance of the trials.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a matter of historical fact, is it not, that the Soviet Union and the state of Finland engaged in armed conflict some time in 1939? A. It is so. During October and November of 1939 the Soviet Government presented to the Government of Finland—

During those two months of October and November of 1939 the Soviet Government presented a series of demands upon the State of Finland, with which it had until then peaceful relations. It demanded valuable strategic and economic territory which it had recognized in the treaty of 1920 as being legally part of Finland, and now, for reasons

which were sufficient to itself, the Soviet Government demanded cession of pieces of territory which were very important economically and strategically to Finland.

When these demands were rejected by the Finland government, the Soviet Union invaded the territory of Finland on November 30, 1939, alleging, however, that Finnish 6622 troops had first invaded Soviet territory. The Soviet Government, however, refused to agree to any impartial investigation of the facts concerning this, and within a few hours after the alleged attack of Finnish troops, Soviet troops were actually well within the Finnish territory. The war then continued until the middle of March 1940.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, an issue of Pravda, marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 176.

Q. Issue of November 30, 1939, which contains a copy of a speech delivered over the radio by Chairman of the Soviet Peoples Commissar for the USSR, Comrade V. M. Molotov, November 29, 1939. I ask you whether you have ever read it before. A. Yes, I have read it in Pravda 6623 shortly after it was published in that organ, and I have since read it a number of times. At that time Mr. Molotov was chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and also People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs and a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This must be regarded as the most authoritative statement of the Soviet view of the war with Finland which had just broken out.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and other publications which have been issued by the Communist Party, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party, that is, the Com-

6624 Communist Party of the United States, toward the Soviet-Finnish conflict? A. Yes, I have. I have read the publications of the Communist Party of the United States at the time, and I have read them again since. The official views as expressed by the Communist Party of the United States gave full support to the Soviet position, threw all blame for hostilities upon the Finnish Government, defended all the claims presented by the Soviet Government, and declared that the action of the Soviet Government against Finland was a step toward strengthening peace. Its expressions of opinion were directly parallel with those of the official Soviet views as expressed in the Soviet press.

* . . . *

Q. I show Dr. Mosely the Daily Worker for Friday, December 1, 1939, and direct your attention to the first page, which has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit 177.

* . . . *

Q. I ask you if you have ever read that page before.

6625 A. Yes, I have I read it at the time and I have read it since.

* . . . *

Q. Did you take into account in arriving at your opinion regarding the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Russo-Finnish conflict the articles appearing on that page?

* . . . *

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. I took this into account at the time and since in forming my opinion concerning the position of the Communist Party in the United States toward the Soviet-Finnish conflict.

* . . . *

6645 Q. Would you state, Dr. Mosely, what the attitude or views of the Soviet Union were towards the invasion of Poland in 1939? A. Through its official spokesmen and through its press, controlled by the Government or the

Party, the Soviet Government stated that Poland had ceased to exist as a state and that therefore it was entitled to take under its protection the eastern territories of former Poland. It stated that the war no longer had any reason to continue, that therefore England and France were 6646 guilty of starting the war because they insisted that they were continuing the war in defense of Poland, which had ceased to exist.

Shortly after this time Soviet spokesmen and the Soviet press declared that the proposals which the German Government had now made for ending the war, leaving Germany in possession of the territories which it had seized, was a positive contribution to peace and that the British and French governments which rejected that offer were therefore guilty of warmongering. The official press went so far as to state that Hitlerism was a matter of taste and not grounds on which a war should be fought. The Soviet Government through its official channels also maintained that the action of the Soviet Government in Poland was a contribution to the strengthening of peace and therefore should be supported.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, which has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit 178, an issue of Pravda for September 18, 1939, page 1, copy of a speech delivered over the radio 6647 by the Chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars of the USSR, Comrade Molotov, September 17, 1939, and also show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 179, Izvestia for October 9, 1939, and ask you whether, in arriving at your opinion as to the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the invasion of Poland, you took into consideration these two items. A. I did.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, are these two items illustrative or do they reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the invasion of Poland? A. They did. The first item, 178, is an official speech by one of the leaders of the Soviet regime. Mr. Molotov at that time was not only chairman of

the Council of People's Commissars, but also People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs and a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Party. The article in Izvestia of October 9, 1939, entitled "Peace or War?" was published in the left-hand side of the front page, which is the normal position for pronouncements of the official government policy.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and other publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitudes of that party toward the Soviet invasion of Poland in late 1939?

6648 THE WITNESS: I have been able to form such an opinion.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion what were the views and attitudes of the Communist Party regarding that particular matter?

A. The Communist Party of the United States approved wholeheartedly the treaty of non-aggression between the Soviet Government and the German Government and declared that it was a contribution to the strengthening of peace and that it deserved universal support.

When the Soviet troops had entered Poland, the official press of the Communist Party of the United States declared again that this was a contribution to peace and that any opposition to it was due only to warmongers. It then went on to state that the German proposals for a settlement based on the military situation then obtaining after the division of Poland were a serious contribution to the restoration of peace and that any governments, meaning the British and French Governments, that rejected it were therefore warmongers and guilty of the war.

6649 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit 180, which

is an issue of the Daily Worker for Tuesday, September 19, 1939, and particularly this article entitled "Keep America out of the Imperialist War." I ask you whether you have ever read this article before. A. Yes, I have; at the time and since.

Q. Did you take it into consideration, in arriving at your opinion regarding the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States regarding the matter which we have under discussion? A. I did take it into account.

THE WITNESS: It is a declaration of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States and therefore was accepted by me as a firm statement of its position on the war which had broken out in Europe.

6650 Q. Dr. Mosely, will you state briefly what was the political status of the three Baltic countries of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, prior to 1940?

MR. ABT: I object.

MR. LaFOLLETTE: Overruled.

MR. LENVIN: Simply background.

THE WITNESS: Prior to 1940, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were independent states, members of the community of nations and members of the League of Nations as long as it functioned. Their independence and territorial integrity had been recognized by the Soviet Government in treaties signed by it in 1920 and 1921, and the Soviet Union had concluded treaties of friendship and non-aggression, and another treaty defining the aggressor.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. By the end of 1940 what was the political status of these three Baltic countries?

THE WITNESS: By the end of 1940 these three formerly independent states had been incorporated into the Soviet Union as union republics.

6651 THE WITNESS: In June 1940 the Soviet Government declared that the existing governments in these three republics were not friendly to the Soviet Government and must be replaced. It also demanded the right to introduce unlimited numbers of Soviet armed forces into their territory. As a result of the formation of new governments in these three republics, one-ticket elections were held, and in the beginning of August 1940 the newly elected bodies requested admission to the Soviet Union. In the beginning of August 1940 this request was granted, and they were formally incorporated into the Soviet Union.

6652 MR. LAFOLLETTE: When the time comes, I am going to permit you to make your record. I still state that the Panel does not consider this testimony as one characterizing the action of the Soviet Union as good, bad or otherwise, but simply as historical background and it is being so treated.

6656 Q. Dr. Mosely, have you been able to form any opinion regarding the attitude and the views which the Soviet Union took toward the incorporation of these three Baltic countries into the Soviet Union? A. Yes, I have. Through statements of official spokesmen and through the official press, the Soviet Government expressed its full approval of the various steps by which the three Baltic Republics were joined to the Soviet Union. Through these statements the Soviet Government declared that these steps were a means of strengthening peace, and they bitterly rejected all criticisms made of those steps and of that annexation.

6657 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit for identification 181, which is a copy of Izvestia for Friday, August 2, 1940, and ask

you whether you have ever read that particular item before.

A. Yes, I have.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this item reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the incorporation of the three Baltic countries which we have been discussing? A. It does, in my opinion. It is a full and authoritative statement of the Soviet interpretation of these events, given by one of the highest leaders of the regime and of the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials, publications, and other matter issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion regarding the views and the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the incorporation of the three Baltic countries that we have been discussing into the territory of the Soviet Union? A. I have been able to form such an opinion.

6658 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 182, which is The Communist for November 1940, and direct your attention to an article entitled "Soviet Socialist Republics in the Baltics," and ask you whether you have ever read this article before. A. Yes, I have read this article at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the incorporation of the three Baltic countries we have been discussing into the territory of the Soviet Union? A. Having been published in the authoritative organ of the Communist Party in the United States, it must be accepted as an expression of the view of that Party toward these events. It supports fully the Soviet interpretation of these events. Its reasoning is parallel to that of the Soviet spokesmen.

6660 Q. Dr. Mosely, what do you understand by the meaning of the term "United Front"?

THE WITNESS: Prior to 1934 the term "United Front" was used generally to mean the advocating of the formation of common groups for action in favor of the aims pursued by the various Communist Parties. This was usually pursued in the form of a United Front from below, that is, an attempt by common action to draw over the supporters of other organizations such as other political parties and trade unions into support of the concrete program of the Communist Party and its affiliates. Sometimes this was pursued by setting up separate organizations, as, for example, among trade unions, sometimes by working within them. The basic concept, however, was that the advancement of the social revolution and the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat demanded that the working class should first be basically united in a single party under Communist leadership and that in order to achieve this it was necessary to discredit and to destroy the leadership of competing parties, particularly those which also claimed to represent the interests of the workers.

During 1934 and 1935 an important shift occurred in the conception of the United Front, both as it affected internal and foreign policy.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You are speaking now of the Soviet Union?

THE WITNESS: Of the separate Communist parties.

6666 THE WITNESS: In 1935 a considerably revised concept of the United Front was adopted as general policy and was codified at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow in July and August 1935. Under this concept it was now not only permissible but desirable to enter into arrangements for the cooperation for common aims with the leaders of other non-communist parties and non-communist trade unions and other social

and economic organizations. This was to be a means of preventing the spread of war and Fascism, of stressing the fact that democracy of the western type, as it is now called, was preferable to fascism, a dictatorship which destroyed autonomy of all organizations and subordinated them to a single totalitarian rule. This was a change in that 6667 it merited and encouraged direct agreements with the leadership of other parties and groups which previously it had been the avowed purpose to destroy.

However, in explaining the importance of the United Front concept, the Secretary-General of the Communist International, the late George Dimitrov, emphasized that the purpose should be to move from the first stage, that of a United Front for electoral purposes and for purposes of exerting pressure upon their respective governments by the Communist Parties in defense of peace and democracy and of the Soviet Union, to the creation of a people's democracy, and that the people's democracy would mean that the Communist Party would be one of the leading parties in the respective governments, and that this would be followed by a further stage, that of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's exhibit for identification 183, which is an 6668 issue of Pravda for August 6, 1935, and an issue of Pravda for August 15, 1935, and which has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit 184.

Q. And I ask you whether in arriving at your concept regarding the United Front you took into consideration those two articles. A. I did. The first, No. 183, was an editorial in Pravda, the official organ of the Central Committee and of the Moscow Committee of the All Union Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union. This was an editorial which appeared in the customary place, on page 1, and would

therefore be regarded by conscientious scholars as representing the viewpoint of the Soviet Government. It advocated union of all anti-fascist forces in defense of democracy and peace.

Exhibit 184 was also published in *Pravda* and consisted of excerpts from the concluding speech of the secretary-general of the Communist International, the late Mr. Dimitroff, in which he set forth in some detail the general approach and tactic recommended by the Communist International at its Seventh Congress to all its member parties.

Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States; have you been able to form any
6669 opinion as to what the views and attitude of that Party were toward the United Front concept at the end of 1935? A. I have.

Q. Will you state what the views and attitude were; in your opinion? A. Through its official resolutions and through editorials in its authorized press, the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently and in detail on the decisions concerning the changed concept and tactic of the United Front. It called for cooperation among all anti-fascist groups and parties on a minimum program for the defense of peace and democracy and the repulsion of war and the growth of fascism. The terms in which its recommendations and policies were set forth paralleled closely the terms and recommendations set forth by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International through its published records and the position taken by the Soviet press on the same issue.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit 185, which is
6670 an issue of *The Communist* for December 1935, and direct your attention to page 1182, which contains the resolutions adopted at the November plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, USA, entitled

"The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and the Tasks of Our Party," and ask you whether you have ever read those resolutions before. A. Yes, I have. I read them at the time and I have read them a number of times since.

Q. In your opinion do these resolutions reflect the views and attitudes of the Communist Party of the United States toward the United Front concept which you have described?

A. This represents a resolution adopted by the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States and would therefore be regarded by any conscientious research worker or scholar as representing the authorized and official point of view of that Party.

6671 Q. It is a historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, as you have already testified, that the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany entered into a treaty of non-aggression in 1939? A. It is the fact. The treaty was dated August 23, 1939.

Q. In your examination of materials and publications emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to arrive at any opinion as to the attitude of the Soviet Government toward Nazi Germany prior to the signing of this non-aggression pact? A. Yes, I have. There was abundant comment by leading Soviet spokesmen and also by the Soviet press. During the period 1934 into the middle of 1939 the

6672 Soviet point of view as expressed repeatedly through these official channels, was that Nazi Germany was preparing aggression, that its leaders were warmongers, that its aim was to destroy democracy and peace and to extend its power by military force. The Soviet Government, through many channels, including speeches at the League of Nations, called for the formation of strong and united forces to prevent the outbreak of a new war and to prevent the development of the Nazi plans for expansion.

Q. Dr. Mosely, have you been able to form any opinion regarding the views of the Soviet Government toward Nazi Germany after the signing of the treaty of non-aggression in 1939? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What was the attitude of the Soviet Government after the signing of the treaty of non-aggression towards Nazi Germany? A. After the signing of the treaty of non-aggression with Germany, of August 23, 1939, the Soviet Government maintained that this treaty was a positive contribution to the maintenance of peace and then when peace was not maintained but was broken by the German attack on

Poland, the Soviet Government maintained that this 6673 treaty was still a contribution to peace in that it limited the spread of the war. After the defeat of Poland and the conquest of Polish territory, the Soviet Government through its official spokesmen and press maintained that there was no further reason to fight, that England and France were guilty of prolonging the war through their insistence on opposing Hitler's ambitions, and the Soviet press stated that Hitlerism was not an adequate motive for continuing the war, that it was a matter of taste or, as Mr. Molotov said in an official speech, it was a matter of political opinion.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like you to refer to the editorial which I have previously shown you, entitled "Peace or War?" which appeared in Izvestia for October 9, 1939, and which has been identified as petitioner's Exhibit 179, and ask you whether in your opinion this editorial reflects the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union toward Nazi Germany as of that date. A. It does, in my opinion. It is one of the expressions of official opinion at the time that Germany had made valuable proposals for concluding peace on the existing military situation as created by the destruction of Poland, and that any country which rejected those proposals was guilty of prolonging the war and of prolonging it, in the opinion of the Soviet, unnecessarily.

6689 MR. LENVIN: I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 186.

Q. Which is an issue of Pravda for November 1, 1939, and I ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. I have. I read it on the following day in the Tass Radio Record. I read it a few days later in the Pravda published in Moscow in Russian, and I have frequently had occasion to refer to it since, both in Russian and in English translation.

Q. And in your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is this report illustrative of the attitude of the Soviet Union toward Nazi Germany as of that date?

6690 THE WITNESS: This statement was made by the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs and a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik before a meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. It is typical of the whole explanation and foundation of Soviet foreign policy of that time. Its basic points were repeated in many forms through newspapers and other published channels.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward Nazi Germany or to the signing of the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Germany? A. I have.

6691 Q. Will you state your opinion? A. Through the examination of the official pronouncements of the Communist Party of the United States and its official publications of that time, an examination which I made at the

time and have made since, it is my opinion that the Communist Party of the United States prior to the conclusion of the Soviet-German treaty of non-aggression of August 23, 1939, regarded Hitler Germany as the main danger to peace and democracy, the main threat of war for conquest and aggression, favored the widest possible cooperation within individual countries and among countries to resist this danger. In this position it paralleled in general terms the position taken by the spokesmen and official publications representing Soviet foreign policy.

By MR. LENVIN:

Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the materials and publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward Nazi Germany after the signing of the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany? A. Yes, I have been able to form an opinion based on a careful study of the published pronouncements of the Communist Party in the United States. After the conclusion of the Soviet-German treaty, the Communist Party of the United States maintained that this was an important contribution to the maintenance of peace and that peace would now be assured. When, however, peace was destroyed by the German invasion of Poland, the Communist official publications in the United States maintained that the Soviet-German pact was a valuable contribution to peace because it would limit the spread of the war. After the completion of the destruction of Poland, the Communist Party of the United States maintained that there was now no reason for further warfare or fighting, that if England and France refused to accept the terms of settlement then offered by Germany, they were guilty of both causing and prolonging the war and that the war was then merely a war for world domination fought by England and France, and that they should receive no assistance from any person or group or country which was in favor of peace.

In this view the Communist Party of the United States through its official publications followed in very similar terms the position taken by the official organs of the Soviet Union in this matter of foreign policy.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked 6694 as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification 187.

Q. Which is an issue of the Daily Worker for August 24, 1939, M-33, and I direct your attention to this article " 'Non-aggression Pact Weapon for Peace, Open to All Nations', says Browder," and I ask you if you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article, both at the time and a number of times since.

Q. In forming your opinion as to the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Soviet-German Pact, did you take into consideration that article? A. I did.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the view of the Communist Party toward the Soviet German non-aggression pact as of that date? A. Yes, it does. Since it appeared in the Daily Worker and since Mr. Browder was then general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, any conscientious scholar would assume that this represented the statement of his views which, as a Party official, he wished to have presented, and would assume that it represents his views and those of the Communist Party of the United States as of that date.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification 188, which is the Daily Worker for Friday, August 25, 1939, and direct your attention to the editorial appearing on the left-hand side of page 1 entitled "A Smashing Blow at Munich Treachery and Aggression," and I ask you whether you have ever read that

editorial before. A. Yes, I have. I read it at that time and I have read it a number of times since.

Q. In arriving at your opinion as to the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, did you take into consideration that article A. Yes, I did. I took into account this article 6696 and other similar articles of the same period.

Q. In your opinion, does this editorial reflect the attitude and views of the Communist Party toward the Soviet-German non-aggression pact as of that date? A. Since it appeared in the Daily Worker in the position of an editorial, any conscientious scholar would assume that it represented the official view of the Party as of that date.

6700 Q. Dr. Mosely, what in your opinion was the attitude of the Soviet Union toward wars in general?

6701 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

The leaders of the Soviet Regime and the formulators of the Soviet version of Marxism have devoted a good deal of attention to the analysis of the character of modern wars, and in particular have developed the doctrine and judgment of just and unjust wars. Wars fought between so-called capitalist and imperialist nations they regard as unjust wars. A war fought by a small people or an oppressed or colonial people for its liberation they consider as a just war. A war fought in defense of a Communist or Communist-led regime they regard as a just war.

Q. In view of your statement, what in your opinion was the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the war which was in progress between England and France on the one 6702 side and Germany on the other subsequent to the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact in 1939?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Is there any termination period on that?

MR. LENVIN: I can put one.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. The period from the signing of the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Germany on the other, and up to June 21, or 22, 1941.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: That conforms with the allegation of your petition.

MR. LENVIN: That is right.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Proceed.

THE WITNESS: During this period the Soviet Spokesmen described the war then going on between England and France on the one side and Germany on the other (France was forced to withdraw from the war in June of 1940) as a war between imperialist blocs and therefore an unjust war. It stated that the character of the two opposing sides was a matter of indifference to the workers and to Communist parties and that they could not support either side in the war. They stated that this was no longer a war for the defense of democracy or for the prevention of further aggression by Nazi Germany, that it was on both sides a war for the domination and redivision of the world.

6703

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would again like to draw your attention to the editorial which has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification 179, an issue of Izvestia for October 9, 1939, which contains an article "Peace or War?" and ask you whether in your opinion this article is illustrative of the attitude of the Soviet Union toward war as of that date.

THE WITNESS: The editorial in Izvestia of October 9, 1939 is a typical and also more detailed statement of the Soviet analysis of the nature of the war which I have tried to summarize as briefly as possible.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I also would like to direct your attention, Dr. Mosely, to the issue of Pravda for November 1, 1939, which has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit 186, a report 6704 of Chairman Molotov, and ask you whether in your opinion that report reflects the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the war then in progress.

A. In my opinion it does reflect the basic and public analysis given by the Soviet spokesmen of the nature of the war going on during that period, from September 1, 1939 to June 22, 1941.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the war in progress in Europe between the date of the signing of the non-aggression pact between Germany and the Soviet Union and June 22, 1941?

A. Yes, I have examined the principal pronouncements of the Communist Party of the United States on the nature of the war during that period. The Communist Party through its official publications maintained that this was an imperialist war, an unjust war, that it was nonsense to say that it was a war for the defense of democracy, that both sides involved in it were imperialists, and that no democratic or progressive persons or groups could support either side in the war.

In this position their expressions parallel very closely the analysis given by the Soviet spokesmen and Soviet published announcements.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified 6705 as Petitioner's Exhibit 189—

Q. —an issue of the Sunday Worker for October 1, 1939, and direct your attention to the article "The People Want the Imperialist War to Stop Now," and ask you whether you have ever read that article, written by Earl Browder.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article, which is the text of a speech delivered by Mr. Browder on Friday, September 29, 1939, and published in the Sunday Worker on October 1, 1939.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is this illustrative of the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war as of that date? **A.** Yes, in my opinion it is a typical statement of the position taken publicly through its official pronouncements by the Communist Party of the United States at that time.

6706 **Q.** Dr. Mosely, again I would like to direct your attention to the article in the Daily Worker of September 19, 1939, which has been identified as Government Exhibit No. 180, which is a statement of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, entitled "Keep America Out of the Imperialist War," and ask you whether in your opinion that statement is illustrative of the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war in progress as of that date. **A.** Yes, in my opinion it is a typical expression of the public views of the Communist Party in the United States concerning the war then in progress.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, Petitioner's Exhibit identified as No. 190—

Q. —which is an issue of The Communist for November 1939, and direct your attention to the article "America and the International Situation," which is a resolution unanimously adopted October 13, 1939, by the political committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and ask you whether you have ever read that report.

6707 **A.** Yes, I have read this at the time and on several occasions since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, do those resolutions fairly reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war in progress as of that date? A. In my opinion, they do.

Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, have you been able to reach any opinion regarding the views and the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the sending of military aid or supplies to either England or France during the period from the signing of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact to June 21 or 22, 1941? A. Yes, I have, on the basis of the official pronouncements of the Soviet Press of that time.

Q. What attitude did the Soviet Union adopt toward that issue? A. The spokesmen of the Soviet regime and the officially controlled Soviet press strongly opposed the repeal of the United States Neutrality Act, the introduction of "cash-and-carry," the transfer of destroyers, and each step of furnishing material means to Great Britain to continue its part in the war against Germany. It denounced as "warmongers," "imperialists," and "lackies of imperialism," and so forth, all those who advocated extending to Great Britain and earlier to France permission to draw war materials and any other resources from the United States for strengthening its part in the war against Germany.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 191—

Q. —which is an issue of Pravda for October 24, 1939, and ask you whether you have ever read this particular article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I read this article in Russian shortly after it was published in Pravda. It is a signed article and analyzes the struggle for and against the Neutrality Act.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is this article illustrative of the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the sending of aid to either Great Britain or France as of that date? A. It is a typical expression of the Soviet point of view on this question.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, an issue of Pravda for October 29, 1939, an article entitled "Removal of Embargo on Export of Arms from the USA," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I read this article in Russian shortly after it was published in Pravda; and I have read it also in the English translation. It is a typical comment and Soviet analysis at that time on the whole question of the removal of the embargo upon the exportation of arms from the United States to belligerent countries.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Then in your opinion, Dr. Mosely, that article reflects the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the sending of material aid to England and France as of that time? A. It does. It is a typical expression of the Soviet analysis and viewpoint as frequently expressed at that time in the official Soviet press.

6710 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the question of sending aid to either Great Britain or France during the period from the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact to June 21, or 22, 1941? A. From the outbreak of war on

September 1, 1939, until June 22, 1941, the official press of the Communist Party of the United States strongly opposed in turn each proposed step for enabling France and Great Britain to draw materials and assistance from the United States in their war against Germany. It opposed the repeal of the Neutrality Act, the introduction of "cash-and-carry," it opposed the destroyer deal, it opposed lend-lease. In its step by step opposition to these proposals, the policy which it advocated parallels directly the policies which were approved by the Soviet Government as expressed through the Soviet press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like to direct your attention to the article which appeared in the Daily Worker for September 19, 1939, by the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America, entitled "Keep America out of the Imperialist War," which has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit 180, and ask you whether in your opinion that article reflects the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the issue of sending aid 6711 to either England or France as of that time.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Was M-41 marked for identification? I didn't get the number if it was.

MR. LENVIN: Not yet, sir.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have examined this declaration of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States. I read it at the time, and I have examined it on several occasions since. In my opinion it should be regarded as an authoritative expression of the views of the Communist Party in the United States on this question and at that time.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 193—

Q.—which is the Daily Worker for May 8, 1941, and I specifically direct your attention to this editorial appearing on

page 1 entitled "Priming America for the Fatal Plunge," and I ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this editorial.

6712 By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the issue of the granting of aid to either England or France as of that time? A. Yes, in my opinion it constitutes an official and authorized expression of the policies advocated by the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States at that time.

Q. It is a matter of historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, that Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union on either June 21 or June 22, 1941? A. Yes, it is.

Q. After this attack on the Soviet Union what was the attitude of that country toward the war then in progress? A. Through its official pronouncements and through the pronouncements published in its official press, the Government of the Soviet Union now declared that the war bore a changed character, that it was now a just war, a war for the defense of the Soviet Union. It also declared that the war between Great Britain and Germany was now a just war, a war for the defense of the rights of peoples, for the defense of democracy, and the restoration of peace. It now declared that aid by the United States to both Great Britain and the Soviet Union was an act of high political
6713 statesmanship and generosity as well as of self-protection for the United States. It urged the continuation and rapid increase of this aid both to Great Britain and to the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 194—

Q. —excerpts from Volume I, "Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union during the Patriotic War"—

Q. —which is a radio address of Josef Stalin. I ask you whether you have ever read that report. A. I read this in an unofficial transcription on the following day. I read it as published in the official Soviet Press within a few weeks after it had been published in Moscow, and I have had occasion to consult frequently this report in both Russian and English. This version appears in an official collection of policy statements issued by the Government of the Soviet Union and entitled "Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union During the Patriotic War." Volume I.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that item reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the
6714 character of the war in progress as of that date?

A. Yes, it does. It is an authoritative statement by an influential member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik, also chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and also chairman of the very powerful Committee on Defense. In my opinion it is an authoritative statement of the Soviet analysis of the changed character of the war.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as
Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 195.

Q. An issue of Izvestia for August 17, 1941, an article entitled "The United Front of the Nations Against Hitler is Growing and Waxing Stronger," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read this in Russian shortly after it was published in Moscow, and I have also had occasion to consult it several times since then in Russian and in English.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the
6715 war then in progress as of that date. A. It does. It

again describes the changed character of the war. It describes the war which was being fought by Great Britain as a just war in defense of the people's rights and it praises the cooperation given by the United States and urges even greater contributions by the United States, and it urges the early opening of a Second Front in Europe, on the mainland of Europe. It praises the growing collaboration and cooperation among the powers in the anti-Hitler coalition and urges all democratic and progressive people throughout the world to support this struggle against aggressive fascism.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that party were toward the war after the German attack on the Soviet Union? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What, in your opinion, was the attitude of the Communist Party at that time? A. On the basis of the published announcements and declarations of the Communist Party of the United States following June 22, 1941, my opinion is that the Communist Party now considered that the war had changed its character, that it was now being fought for the defense of democracy and people's rights and for the destruction of aggression. It praised the struggle being waged by Great Britain, and it urged all-out support by the United States both to Great Britain and the Soviet Union. It now attacked all those groups and persons who opposed such assistance and declared that they were now agents of Hitler.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, Petitioner's Exhibit marked for identification 196—

Q. —which is the Sunday Worker for July 13, 1941, and specifically direct your attention to Article by Gil Green entitled "The Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union and the Changed Character of the World War," and ask you

whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article at the time and have had occasion to re-read it since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this article fairly reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war in progress as of that date? A. It is a detailed statement of the changed view of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war following the events of June 22, 1941. It is typical of many such comments, and its arguments and its presentation run directly parallel to the views expressed in the official Soviet press at that time and on that issue.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 197—

Q. —The Communist for July 1941, and direct your attention to the statement of the Communist Party, USA, commencing on page 579, entitled "Support the USSR in its fight against Nazi war," and ask you whether you have ever read that statement before. A. Yes, I have read the statement. It was published first on June 22, 1941, a few hours after the invasion of the Soviet territory by the German Nazi armies, and it was republished as a basic statement of the position adopted by the Communist Party of the United States and of the policies which it advocated.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that statement reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the war then in progress as of that date. A. Yes, it does. It urged full support for the Soviet war. It attacked all those who would hesitate or doubt any matter of providing aid to the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, you have already testified that prior to the attack on the Soviet Union by the Nazi Government, both the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the United States opposed any material aid to England

and France. My question is, did that same opposition continue after the German attack on the Soviet Union. A. No, that opposition ceased. The Soviet press now praised American aid to both Great Britain and the Soviet Union, and urged its very rapid increase. The official press of 6720 the Communist Party of the United States similarly now urged all-out aid and attacked bitterly all persons and groups who wished to limit or not to support such aid.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 198 for identification—

Q. Which is an issue of Pravda for August 16, 1941— and which you have marked as M-46, Mr. Chairman.

Q. I ask you whether you have ever read this before. A. Yes, I read a telegraph summary of this on the following day after it was issued in Moscow. I read the full text in the Russian language a few weeks afterwards, and I have also examined it in Russian and English more recently. It is an official statement of the point of view of the 6721 Soviet Government and of the All Union Communist Party concerning the relations among the Allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, and between them and the United States.

Q. I would also like to direct your attention, Dr. Mosely, to the issue of Izvestia of August 17, 1941, an article which is entitled "The United Front of the Nations Against Hitler is Growing and Waxing Stronger," which was previously marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 195, and ask you whether in your opinion that article reflects the changed attitude of the Soviet Union toward both the United States and Great Britain in connection with their collaboration in the conduct of the war. Would you like to see that one again? A. I would like to see that one, too, to be certain of my identification.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Yes, I have read that at the time and since this editorial in *Izvestia* of August 17, 1941. It, like the preceding document, praises the growing cooperation among the allies, including both those that were actively engaged in hostilities against Germany and those who were not, which was the case of the United States at that time. It praises the common war efforts and assures its readers of the community of aims in defense of peace and democracy as pursued by the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States.

6722 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other material issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party regarding the question of the granting of aid to the Western Allies after the German attack on the Soviet Union? A. Yes, I have.

Q. What was that attitude? A. After the German Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union in June 1941 the official pronouncements and the official press of the Communist Party of the United States were entirely in favor of all-out support to the war effort both of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, and it urged to American people the urgency of giving full aid and support to the struggle of Britain and the Soviet Union against Germany.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 199—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 199.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is The Communist for August 1941, and specifically direct your attention to the Manifesto of the National Committee, Communist Party, United States of America, adopted at its plenary meeting June 28-29, 1941, entitled "The People's Program of Struggle for the
6723 Defeat of Hitler and Hitlerism!" and ask you

whether you have ever read that manifesto before.
 A. Yes, I read this manifesto shortly after it was issued and also on other occasions more recently. It is an official pronouncement of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, urging all-out American support to the Soviet Union and also to Great Britain, and attacking as agents and supporters of Hitler all persons and groups who opposed the fuller contribution of the United States to this side in the struggle.

Q. Dr. Mosely, again I would like to direct your attention to what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 196, which is the article appearing in the Sunday Worker for July 13, 1941, entitled "The Nazi Aggression Against the Soviet Union and Changed Character of the World War," by Gil Green, and ask you whether in your opinion that article reflects the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States towards the issue we have just been discussing. A. This article, which I have read on several occasions, is a clear and detailed statement from the point of view of the Communist Party of the United States of the changed character of the war, of the just struggle being waged by the Soviet Union and Great Britain as well as by the liberation groups and resistance groups, and
 6724 it demands all-out support by the United States in the struggle. In its line of reasoning it is, like the preceding three exhibits, directly parallel with the analysis and viewpoint expressed by the official press of the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, after the attack on the Soviet Union by Germany did the Soviet Union as far as you know propose any specific military expedition to the British Government?
 A. Yes. It is a matter of historic and documentary record that the Soviet Government now urged the British Government to prepare and carry out as soon as possible the landing of a large expeditionary force on the mainland of Europe in order to open a second front on the mainland of Continental Europe.

Q. Now I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 200—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 200.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —an excerpt from "The Second World War," specifically the volume entitled "The Grand Alliance," by Winston S. Churchill, and specifically direct your attention to the excerpt which contains a translation of a letter from Josef Stalin to the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, dated the 18th of July 1941, and ask you whether
6725 you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read these pages in volume 3, of the Second World War, by Winston S. Churchill. This purports to be an English translation of the message communicated by Mr. Stalin to Mr. Churchill, then Prime Minister. As Mr. Churchill was the recipient and also replied to this letter and is the author of the volume in which it appears as a document, I should feel obliged as a scholar to accept it as documentary evidence.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that letter reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the opening of a second front as of that time? A. Yes, it does. It states forcefully the reasons why the Soviet Government strongly desired to have a second front immediately. It entered into the factors which in its opinion made it possible for Great Britain to establish a second front immediately, and it implied that this front could be established at once.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, a copy of the New York Times for Friday, February 27, 1942, which contains the text of Ambassador Litvinov's address before the Overseas Press Club at the Waldorf Hotel, and ask you whether you have ever read that address before.

6726 THE WITNESS: Yes, I read the text of this address at the time and since.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that address reflect the attitude and views of the Soviet Government toward the issue of the opening of the second front as of that date?

A. Yes, it does. It states fully the reasons why the Soviet Government considered the second front urgent and stated the factors which in the opinion of the Soviet Government made it possible to open the second front at that time and without delay.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the question of the opening of a second front at that time?

A. Yes, I have. This problem was commented upon continually by the official press of the Communist Party of the United States. The spokesmen of the Communist Party maintained

that a second front must be opened immediately and
6727 that it could be opened without delay. The spokes-

men discussed and brushed aside all reasoning based upon the lack of such preparation in trained manpower and equipment and shipping, as well as in the accumulation of airpower, and frequently maintained that delay in establishing a second front, which it considered was urgently needed in the interest of the defense of the Soviet Union, was due to ill will or to persons influenced by German fascism. Its reasoning on this problem followed in general the point of view advanced by official spokesmen and the official press of the Soviet Union.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 202, which is M-50(a), which is an issue of The Communist for April 1942 and specifically direct your attention to an article by Eugene Dennis, commencing on page 199, entitled "For a Second Front in Europe! To the Offensive Against Hitler!" and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

(The document referred to was marked for identification
Petitioner's Exhibit No. 202.)

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Dennis both at the time and more recently. It develops more fully than I have tried to do in my very brief summary, the reasons why the second front was urgently demanded in the view of the Communist Party of the United States and the factors which in its opinion were responsible for the delay.

6728

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article fairly reflect the view and attitude of the Communist Party toward the question of the opening of a second front as of that date? A. Yes, it does. In my opinion it is a typical expression of the views officially presented by the Communist Party of the United States on that issue at that time, and an exposition of the policies advocated by it.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 203—

(The document referred to was marked for identification
Petitioner's Exhibit 203.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. which is an issue of The Communist for May 1942, and direct your attention to the Manifesto of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, entitled "Attack Hitler Now, Open a Western Front in Europe," and ask you whether you ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read the manifesto referred to. I read it at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, does that manifesto reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party as of that date on the question of the opening of a second front in Europe?

A. Yes, it is a typical and detailed expression of the views and policies advocated by the Communist Party of the United States on that issue and at that time.

6729

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a historical fact, is it not, that the Communist International was dissolved in May of 1943?

A. Yes, it is. The dissolution of the Communist International, which was founded in March 1919 in Moscow, was announced in Moscow in May 1943.

Q. Now I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 204, which is M-55—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 204.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —“Foreign policy of the Soviet Union during the Patriotic War,” J. Stalin, which contains the reply of Comrade Stalin to a question asked by the chief correspondent of the British Agency Reuters, and ask you whether you have ever read this before. A. Yes, I read it at the time as transmitted by the press and also read it in the Soviet newspapers of the time. I have re-read it in the collection of documents and pronouncements on the “Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union during the Patriotic War,” volume I.

6730 Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this item reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the dissolution of the Comintern? A. Yes, it does, in my opinion. Marshal Stalin was then the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and a leading member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik. Hence, in my opinion, it is a highly authoritative statement of the point of view of the Soviet leadership on this problem. In this statement Marshall Stalin explained why he considered that this step would promote victory over the common enemy, why it would promote greater unity among the freedom loving nations, and therefore why it was a useful and necessary step.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that party were toward the dissolution of the Communist International in May of 1943? A. Yes, I have. Through its official pronouncements the Communist Party of the United States expressed its full concurrence and approval in the abolition of the Communist International and stated that this form of organization was no longer useful or expedient in the new stage of the struggle for democracy and socialism, and it stated that of course cooperation among the workers and workers' 6731 parties, meaning of course the Communist parties, in their terminology, would continue and would take on new forms.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 205—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 205.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for May 26, 1943, and direct your attention, first, to the series of articles by James S. Allen, entitled "The Comintern Decision: Historic Step Long Maturing," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article at the time and have reread it more recently. It is a detailed statement of the point of view which I have tried to outline as briefly as possible. It follows the same line of reasoning as that set forth in the manifesto of the executive committee of the now dissolved Communist International and in general it follows the line of reasoning as set forth in the interview of Marshal Stalin with the foreign correspondent.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 206 for identification, which is the Daily Worker for Monday, May 31, 1943, and direct your attention to the article by James S. Allen, entitled "Comin-

tern Decision Marks New Period of Working Class
6732 Activity," and ask you whether you have ever read
that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I read this article at the time it ap-
peared and also more recently.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the
views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United
States toward the dissolution of the Communist Interna-
tional? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is a typical expres-
sion of the interpretation given to that event by the Com-
munist Party of the United States through its official
pronouncements.

Q. I now show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked
as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 207—

Q. —The Communist for July 1943, and direct your atten-
tion to the resolution on the dissolution of the Communist
International, part of the resolutions and statements of the
National Committee plenum.

6733 Q. I ask whether you have ever read this resolu-
tion before. A. Yes, I have read this resolution at
the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that resolution fairly
reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United
States towards the dissolution of the Communist Interna-
tional as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this should be
regarded as an official and authoritative statement of the
viewpoint and policy of the Communist Party of the United
States on this issue at that time, and it is parallel with the
resolution adopted in May 1943 by the Executive Committee

of the Communist International and also with the interview given by Marshal Stalin to a foreign correspondent in May 1943, and Marshal Stalin was of course a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International prior to its dissolution.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a historical fact, is it not, that the Communist Party itself was dissolved in May of 1944 and the Communist Political Association established? A. Yes, I read of that in the press at the time.

Q. Have you ever, as a result of the research and study that you have made, been able to arrive at an opinion as to the reasons for the dissolution of the Communist Party and the substitution therefor of the Communist Political Association?

6735 Q. It is a historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, that the Communist Party of the United States was reconstituted in July of 1945? A. Yes, according to the official pronouncements of the press, first of the Communist Political Association and then of the reconstituted Communist Party of the United States, this was the case. It was reconstituted in July 1945.

6743 Q. Dr. Mosely, can you identify Jacques Duclos? A. Yes, on the basis of his writings and facts published concerning his career in the Communist press of France, particularly France, he has been a leading member of the French Communist Party for many years, was a member—

MR. LAFOLLETTE: For how many years, if you can recall?

THE WITNESS: My recollection, without consulting anything, is since 1934, but that may not be right.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: That is more helpful to me than many years. Some people's idea of him is five, some people's idea is 15.

THE WITNESS: The reason I think it was in 1934 is that my recollection is that he was back and forth between Moscow and Paris quite a bit in the preceding six years, but I couldn't on the spur of the moment identify the exact dates.

He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, dissolved in 1943. Since 6744 1947 he has attended a number of meetings and conferences held by the Communist Information Bureau as the authorized spokesman of the French Communist Party. He is frequently described in the French Communist Press as a leading theorist of Marxism-Leninism.

6745 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 208—

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for July 1945—

Q. —and direct your attention to an article mentioned on page 656 entitled "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States," by Jacques Duclos, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article in French, in the French Communist organ, and I have re-read it more recently in 6746 this English translation which appeared in Political Affairs for July 1945. In this article Monsieur Duclos states the reasons—

Q. Will you continue, Dr. Mosely? A. Monsieur Duclos comments on both national and international reasons why, from the point of view of a French Communist, it was a mistake to dissolve the Communist Party of the United States and was necessary to reconstitute the Party. I should prefer to concentrate on the international aspects of his reason for the sake of brevity. Monsieur Duclos states that the United States political and economic system

remains under the control of what he calls capitalists, plutocrats, reactionaries, that therefore its foreign policy aims will be guided by that dominant power, as he describes it, and therefore it is essential for the United States to have a Communist Party which could undertake from the point of view of Marxist-Leninist criticism of events and policies of other parties to defend the basic principles of Marxism and Leninism. He also states that during the period 6747 of the Communist Political Association in the United States, this association exaggerated the durability and long-range value of the Teheran and other common declarations issued by the three governments, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, and that it was dangerous to assume that such cooperation would continue after the war, that it was necessary for a well organized and carefully identified Communist Party to defend the interests of true peace and true democracy in the United States and not to rely upon any alleged change in the character of the government and society of the United States.

6748 Q. Dr. Mosely, do you have any knowledge of the extent to which this Duclos article was publicized?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Where? In the United States?

MR. LENVIN: All over the world.

6749 MR. LAFOLLETTE: Do you include "all over the world" in your question?

MR. LENVIN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: It was issued through the official theoretical organ of the French Communist Party in April 1945.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What is the name of that article?

THE WITNESS: Cahiers du Communisme. It was reissued in English translation in the American organ, The Communist, of July 1945.

6756 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 209—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 209)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for September 1945, and specifically direct your attention to the article commencing on page 800, entitled "The Reconstitution of the Communist Party," by John Williamson, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. 6757 Yes, I have. I read it at the time and more recently.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article indicate the view of the Communist Party of the United States regarding the dissolution of the Communist Party and its reconstitution following the Duclos article? A. It does. In my opinion it parallels very closely the criticisms and suggestions contained in the Duclos article—

Q. Dr. Mosely, I also show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 210 which is an issue of Political Affairs for September 1945 and specifically direct your attention to the resolution of the National Convention of the Communist Party, USA, adopted July 28, 1945, entitled "Present Situation and the Next 6758 Tasks," and ask you if you have ever read those resolutions before. A. Yes, I read them at the time and I have read them more recently.

Q. In your opinion do these resolutions reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the dissolution of the Communist Party and its reconstitution as stated in the Duclos article. A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It lists the next tasks to be pursued by the Communist Party of the United States, and it recognizes the criticisms in lines exactly parallel to those laid down in the Duclos criticism. It calls for the strengthening of the foreign policy pursued by the Soviet Government. It calls for prevention of the victory of Fascism in the United States. It attacks many aspects of the policy of the United States along the same lines which were already beginning to appear in the summer of 1945 in the official Soviet press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, what in your opinion is the significance of the Duclos article?

6759 THE WITNESS: In my opinion the Duclos article represented an authoritative criticism and series of suggestions or recommendations made by an outstanding—

MR. ABT: I didn't get the word. Series of suggestions and what?

THE WITNESS: And recommendations of action which were made by an outstanding leader of the international Communist movement, by a man who had served frequently as the spokesman of his own party in the French Chamber and in French public life and in his published writings, and who prior to 1943 and after 1947 appeared regularly as a spokesman for the international organization of the Communist Parties.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Which international?

6760 THE WITNESS: Prior to 1943 Monsieur Duclos was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. After 1947 he frequently represented the French Communist Party at the conferences of the Cominform or Information Bureau of the Communist parties.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What position did he hold in any of the international organizations of the Communist Party, if any, at the time the question arose of the American Communist Party?

THE WITNESS: At that time, sir, there was no public organization uniting the various Communist Parties. However, a few weeks before the article was published by Monsieur Duclos he returned to Paris from Moscow.

MR. ABT: Object, Mr. Chairman, and move to strike the answer as not responsive to the question, and it has no probative value whatsoever.

MR. LENVIN: The witness testified—

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I think it might have some probative value. How do you arrive at your information concerning the last fact you stated?

THE WITNESS: From the French Communist newspaper, Humanité, of that time, March 1945.

6761 Q. Dr. Mosely, in view of your last answer do you know of any other instance where an article or statement by Duclos indicated or revealed or announced a change of policy or attitude in either the attitude of the Soviet Union or the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or the International Communist movement.

MR. ABT: I object, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: He is only asking now if he knows of any other instance. Overruled. Just answer whether you know of any other instance.

THE WITNESS: I recall clearly two other instances in which Monsieur Duclos gave the basic line.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. Will you state those two instances that you recall?

THE WITNESS: One instance occurred at the beginning of September 1939, when there was a speech by Monsieur Duclos which sets the pattern of the resistance of the French Communist Party to French participation in the war against Germany, stating that this war was against the interests of the working class in France and that it represented a conspiracy of the so-called ruling groups in France with
6762 Germany. As a result of this line, the French Communist Party was outlawed and Monsieur Duclos disappeared from the public scene, and later re-emerged in Moscow.

6764 Go ahead. You said there were two. What was the other instance, please?

THE WITNESS: The second instance which I recall immediately and in detail, is that Monsieur Duclos inaugurated a very strong campaign of the French Communist Party

against the Marshall Plan by his major speech at a large public gathering in Paris in August 1947.

By Mr. LaFOLLETTE:

I ask you, Doctor, as a result of your reading and study and pursuing this subject of Russian foreign policy, whether or not there was an announced Russian foreign policy on the Marshall Plan? If your answer is yes, when it was announced?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

When was it announced?

THE WITNESS: A firm Russian position on the Marshall Plan was taken on July 4, 1947, roughly one month before the Duclos speech which marked the inauguration of a major campaign to disrupt the arrival, distribution and use of Marshall Plan aid in France.

6766 Q. Dr. Mosely, can you tell us briefly what was the Montreux Convention, please?

MR. ABT: I object.

6767 MR. LENVIN: Just background, Mr. Chairman. We can't clearly understand the issue involved as stated in paragraph (m) unless we have some historical background material. I don't mind if you want to eliminate it all, if the Panel feels they don't need this historical background for a full understanding of the issues.

MR. LaFOLLETTE: I think we know something about it, but I don't see how it would do any harm. Briefly, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: The Montreux Convention of the year 1936 regulated the passage of the Turkish Straits and the passage of the air space over the Turkish Straits. It returned this area and the territorial waters and the air space over them to full Turkish sovereignty, including the right to fortify them and to hold military exercises in them. This convention was signed by the Soviet Government, which had taken a detailed part in its negotiation. It is still in force.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. Did there come a time when the Soviet Government made some proposal to revise this convention? A. There did, yes. Beginning in 1939, the Soviet Government proposed to the Turkish Government that they should disregard the Montreux Convention and that joint Soviet-Turkish bases should be established, both Naval and air bases, in the vicinity of the Straits.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in 1946 what in your opinion was the position of the Soviet Union regarding the Montreux Convention in 1936?

THE WITNESS: In 1946, by a series of notes addressed by it to the Turkish Government and published by the Soviet Government, the Soviet Government demanded the establishment of joint Soviet-Turkish bases in and near the Turkish Straits and joint control over the waters of the Straits and the air space above them. It also demanded at this time through its published statements a change in the Turkish Government, declaring the existing government unfriendly because it rejected these Soviet demands.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 211—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 211)

Q. —which is an issue of Izvestia for August 24, 1946, and specifically direct your attention to page 4, article entitled "From the History of the Question of the Black Sea Straits," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have. I read it at the time and re-read it in the English translation.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this article

reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Montreux Convention of 1936? A. Yes. It summarizes the Soviet arguments for revising the Montreux Convention, destroying the rights of other signatories besides Turkey.

6772 MR. LAFOLLETTE: You may elaborate your answer on this document marked for identification Exhibit 211.

THE WITNESS: The article in question states that the Soviet proposals for a new regime for the Turkish Straits are just and well founded. It attacks all opponents of those proposals as imperialists.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 212—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 212)

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of the Daily Worker for Monday, August 26, 1946, and direct your attention to an article entitled "Our Dardanelles Policy," by James S. Allen, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read it.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article fairly reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Montreux Convention of 1936?

A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is a signed article by a regular contributor to the Daily Worker. It supports fully the Soviet proposals concerning the Turkish Straits and makes many accusations against all those who objected to or criticized those proposals. Its reasoning is directly parallel to that of the Soviet official press at the same time on this question.

Q. Merely as background, Dr. Mosely, will you describe briefly the internal political situation in that area of Europe generally known as the Balkans, and specifically the countries of Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Yugoslavia?

6774 THE WITNESS: In the case of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, these three countries were under armistices concluded with their new regimes by the three major allies, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States, and at the Yalta Conference in February 1945 the three major powers agreed upon a statement of policy toward these three countries. They agreed to promote the development of the basic freedoms—

MR. APT: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

6780 MR. PAISLEY: We will avoid questions on background from now on.

6783 MR. LENVIN: My next question will be directed to the Panel and inquire whether the Panel will take judicial notice of the fact that in Balkan countries, Roumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Poland, there were coalition governments established which included a Communist Party.

6784 MR. LAFOLLETTE: Yes, immediately following the end of World War II.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries in the period, let's say, from about 1945 to 1947. A. During this period from 1945 to roughly the middle of 1947, the official Soviet press praised the coalition governments in these east European and Balkan—

MR. ABT: I understood the question to be the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Communist Parties in these countries.

MR. LENVIN: Let him finish his answer. He said they were praising the coalition governments. Give the man a chance to finish.

MR. LaFOLLETTE: Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: It praised the coalition governments and the role of the Communist Parties within them and asserted that this system of cooperation between Communist and non-Communist governments formed the basis of the so-called people's democracy which was presented as a very important step in the political progress of these countries. The Soviet official press assumed that this status would continue. In other words, the coalition government 6785 was a desirable and useful and progressive step.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 213 for identification—

Q.—which is an issue of Izvestia—

Q.—which is an issue of Izvestia for September 20, 1945, and direct your attention to page 4 which contains a reprint of Comrade V. M. Molotov's speech at the press conference at the Soviet Embassy in London, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have. I read it on the same day in London, and I have referred to it frequently since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that speech reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Balkan countries we have been discussing as of that date?

A. Yes, it does. As the Commissar of Foreign Affairs and member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik, Mr. Molotov spoke authoritatively; and in his opinion the situation and the

6786 political development in Roumania, Bulgaria and Hungary was entirely satisfactory, and he rejected out of hand all criticisms which had been made concerning the alleged failures of these three governments in the area under Soviet military control to carry out the conditions which had been agreed upon at Yalta among the big three powers.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 214—

Q. —which is an issue of Pravda for October 22, 1947, and an article by A. Zhdanov.

Q. Entitled "The International Situation," which is a report made to the informational conference of representatives of a number of Communist parties held in Poland at the close of September 1947, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read this in an excerpt on the following day, and I read it in full in Russian about a week later and I have frequently used it in full as reference in my research work. I have reread it recently both 6787 in Russian and in English.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that report by Zhdanov reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Governments of the Balkan countries that we have been discussing? A. In my opinion it does. Zhdanov was then a member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He was also the principal Soviet representative at the organizing conference of the Information Bureau of several Communist Parties held at an unnamed place in Poland in the second half of September 1947. His statement was reprinted in many languages roughly one month after it was held and has been frequently republished since and referred to as a basic statement of the Soviet position on international policy at that time.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Referred to by whom, the Soviet Government?

THE WITNESS: By the Soviet Government. It has been made available in many editions, both in pamphlet form and republished in editions of several hundred thousand copies at a time.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party 6788 of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward those Balkan countries which we have been discussing in the period from about 1945 to about 1947?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. In the official publications of the Communist Party of the United States the point of view taken throughout this time was a strong defense of the people's democracies, so-called people's democracies as they were developing, a strong defense of Soviet policy in this part of Europe, and praise for the role of the Communist Parties in the so-called people's democracies. At the same time the official publications of the Communist Party of the United States accused the United States and Great Britain of striving to destroy democracy in these countries and to extend their so-called imperialist control over them. In its expressions of published views the Communist Party of the United States used the terms and followed lines of reasoning directly parallel with that of the official Soviet press and the official Soviet spokesmen.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 215 for identification.

6789 Q. Which is an issue of Political Affairs for November 1945, and direct your attention to an article by Eugene Dennis, entitled "The London Conference," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

A. Yes. I read it at the time and reread it more recently. It is a statement of full praise for the development and events in the so-called people's democracies, of praise for the Soviet policy and of condemnation for the allegedly imperialist policy of the United States in relation to these countries.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 216 for identification—

Q. —which is our M-67, an issue of Political Affairs for June 1947 and direct your attention to an article entitled "The National Question in Europe," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

A. Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Foster.

Q. In your opinion, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Balkan countries of that date? A. Yes, it does. It is a full statement of approval for the policies followed by the Governments in the so-called people's democracy and for the leading role of the USSR in guiding the postwar development of those countries. It also attacks the policies advocated by the United States Government in relation to these countries along lines directly parallel with the views published by the Soviet Press and presented by Soviet official spokesmen.

6791 Q. It is a historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, that the Communist Party, which was a part of the coalition governments of certain Balkan countries, such as Hungary, Roumania, Albania, and Bulgaria, gained complete control of those governments?

6792 THE WITNESS: Since the process of establishing complete control by the Communist Parties in each country occurred by stages, it may be necessary to mention several dates.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You may elaborate.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

In the case of Hungary the major change occurred in the last week of May 1947, when the Communist Party and those ministries which it controlled, including the Ministry of Interior, controlling the police, destroyed effectively the party organizations of the other parties which had been members of the coalition government.

6793 THE WITNESS: It is true that a number of persons belonging to other parties aside from the Communist Party continued to hold certain positions until May 1949 in Hungary, but from that time on there was no longer any prominent non-Communist in the government, and even before that time no non-Communist party had been allowed to organize and to carry on what would be regarded as a normal democratic political activity.

In the case of Roumania major changes toward completion of Communist control came in August and September 1947, when the principal non-Communist members of the government were removed and in the following months the Communist Party completed the establishment of its complete domination over the government.

In the case of Bulgaria a turning point also occurred in May 1947 when the non-Communist parties were forced to disband themselves, and while a few individuals were continued in government positions for some months, 6794 their parties had already been destroyed. By the end of 1948 the complete monopoly of control by the Communist Party in Bulgaria had been established.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Is there any other?

MR. LENVIN: No, I think that satisfies us.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I didn't know whether you included Albania in your question.

MR. LENVIN: Yes, I think I did include Albania.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: I don't believe you answered that part of the question, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: The situation in Albania at the close of the war was that the so-called people's front, which was dominated by the Communist Party in Albania, had come into power and that since that time, from that time in January 1946 to be exact, non-Communist parties were prevented from carrying on their activities. Thus the name of a people's front was maintained, but an actual monopoly of political activity and the exercise of political power was established as early as January 1946 in Albania and, with various disputes and purges within the Communist Party, has continued in control since then.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the governments of these Balkan countries that I have just mentioned after the Communist Party in those countries gained complete control of the respective governments? **A.** Yes, I have. The Soviet press and Soviet official spokesmen have commented frequently on these developments. They have given their full approval to each step by which complete Communist control was established. They have rejected vehemently all objections made from outside; and they have also changed their interpretation of the nature of the so-called People's Democracy. And beginning in 1948 it was declared that the coalition governments of the first two years after the war had been merely an expedient and a transitional form and that the real purpose of the Communist Parties during that time had been to increase their power at the expense of the other parties which had been members of the same coalitions. The theory that the so-called People's Democracy represented a different type of socialism was now rejected. It was stated it was simply a variation of tactics leading toward the establishment of the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, after having maintained for some two

and a half years that the so-called People's Democracy represented a different, in other words a non-Soviet, path of development, it was now declared this was not the case and that this was simply another way of leading up to 6796 the establishment of a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. Since any proletarian, so-called proletarian, who does not loyally support the Communist party is considered simply a stooge of capitalism, the connection between Communist Party control and dictatorship of the Proletariat has traditionally been very close.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 217—

Q.—which is an issue of Pravda for March 11, 1950, and contains a speech by Comrade V. M. Molotov—

Q.—at the meeting of the voters of the Molotov election district of the city of Moscow, delivered March 10, 1950. I ask you whether you have ever read that speech before. A. Yes, I have read the speech in full in Pravda in Russian, and I have also read this extensive excerpt presented in the English translation in this document. Mr. Molotov at the time was a member of the politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and this is considered an authoritative statement of the official Soviet position.

6797 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitudes of that party toward the Balkan countries we have been discussing from approximately the middle of 1947 on? A. Yes, I have. The official spokesmen of the Communist Party of the United States and its authoritative publications have commented frequently on each development of events, each major development of events in the so-called People's Democracies in Eastern Europe.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 218, M-69—

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for March 1948 and direct your attention to a report commencing on page 195, which is a report on the international situation delivered at the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, held February 3 to 5, 1948, and entitled "World Democracy's Struggle Against American Imperialism," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes,

I have read this article by Mr. Foster, both at the 6798 time and since. It is a full justification of the various steps taken in the so-called People's Democracies. It approves the Soviet policy of supporting that course of development. It attacks the policy of the United States in relation to those countries. In all these attitudes it parallels directly the position taken in the official Soviet press of that time.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 219—

Q. —which is an article in Political Affairs for June 1950, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 14, entitled "People's Front and People's Democracy," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article of Mr. Foster.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitudes of the Communist Party toward those Balkan countries which we have been discussing as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it is an authoritative presentation of the point of view of the leader of the Communist Party of the United States. It approves each named 6799 step in the political development of the so-called People's Democracies. It praises the decisive role, as he describes it, of the Soviet armies and of Soviet

power in promoting this course of development. It renounces as mistaken the approval which Mr. Foster states was given in 1946 and 1947 to the theory that the People's Democracies represented a new path of development toward socialism and states that this should have been regarded simply as a variation in tactics in striving for the same goal of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He also attacks as imperialism, each step as described by him, taken by the United States Government in trying to influence the course of developments in that part of Europe.

His presentation is directly parallel to the official presentation of this problem by the Soviet press.

6801 Q. Dr. Mosely, it is agreed that the Panel will take judicial notice that in the immediate postwar period there was a coalition government existing in Czechoslovakia, of which the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was a part. Will you tell the Panel for how long that coalition government continued? A. The coalition government continued from October 1944 until the second half of February 1948.

Q. And what happened after that date?

THE WITNESS: In February 1948 during a cabinet crisis the Communist Party, which maintained control of the police through control of the Ministry of Interior, and which maintained control of the state radio through the Ministry of Information, took over control in the country. In doing so it also called upon the support of a large number of action committees organized in advance.

THE WITNESS: After the new government was formed, the other parties either were dissolved, or dissolved themselves, by the end of April 1948 and from that time the only legal party was the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Some individuals who had formerly be-

longed to other parties continued for a time in office. Some of them were admitted to membership in the Communist Party. But all organized parties aside from the Communist Party were dissolved and by new laws forbidden to reorganize.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 220—

○ (The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 220.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of a publication known as "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," published by the Communist Information Bureau, the issue being that of March 1, 1948, and direct your attention to an article entitled "Victory of the People of Czechoslovakia," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article at the time and have reread it recently.

Q. In your opinion, does that article fairly reflect the view of the Communist Information Bureau toward the internal political situation existing in Czechoslovakia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does, since it is published in the official organ of the Information Bureau 6803 of the Communist Parties, at that time published in Belgrade under the responsible editorship of Mr. Yudin, who had been for 25 years a recognized spokesman of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, and was at this time the editor of this journal located in Belgrade.

6804 Q. Dr. Mosely, this article which you have stated you have read comes from the publication entitled "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, Belgrade. I wonder if you would tell us, if you know, about

the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties. A. The Information Bureau of the Communist Parties was established as a result of a decision taken at a conference held somewhere in Poland toward the end of September 1947.

At this founding conference, which was announced publicly on October 22, 1947, the authorized representatives of several Communist Parties were present. These were the Communist Parties or in certain cases they are called the Workers' Parties, of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Italy, and France. At that time it was announced that the representatives of these parties had decided that it would be useful and expedient in promoting unity of action among these parties to establish a central organ for the exchange of experience and for consideration of common problems, and this center was established as the Information Bureau at first in Belgrade, where it began publication of this journal, "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," in November 1947, and in July 1948 its headquarters were removed to Bucharest. The original name given to the Information Bureau was the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties of Several Countries. Its present title is the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is this publication "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," the official mouthpiece of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties? A. It contains both signed and unsigned articles. The signed articles have been published under the names of leaders and prominent spokesmen of many of the Communist Parties, including Communist Parties outside those which are members of the Bureau itself.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like to call to your attention again the issue of Pravda of October 22, 1947, which contains the report by Zhdanov on the international situation.

6811 Q. I ask you whether in your opinion that report fairly reflects the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as of that date.

Would you like to see that again? A. Yes.

THE WITNESS: In this major report on the international situation the late Mr. Zhdanov praised the role of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, which was then a member of a coalition government with four other parties. It stated that the policy of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia and of the coalition government in Czechoslovakia was progressive and democratic and it rejected all criticism of it and assured it of Soviet approval.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 221—

6812 Q. —which is the Daily Worker for Wednesday, May 29, 1946, and direct your attention to the editorial entitled "Czechoslovakia's Way," and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have examined this editorial in the Daily Worker for May 29, 1946.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. And in your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as of that date? A. Yes, this editorial praises the activity and successes of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, praises its support of a coalition government and states that the conduct of free elections in Czechoslovakia proves that

the Communists are the best fighters for democracy and that the power of the Communist Party is not incompatible with democracy. In other words, it praises fully the then policy of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia along lines directly parallel with the expressions of official opinion by the leaders of the Soviet Government and by the official and party press in the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 222—

6813 Q. —which is an issue of "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," for January 1, 1949, and direct your attention to this little article entitled "Results of Czechoslovak-Soviet Talks," and ask you if you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the attitude of the Soviet Union and the International Communist movement toward the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia as of that date? A. Yes. This is a typical expression of the support of the Soviet Government for the Czechoslovak government of that date.

6814 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the events in Czechoslovakia leading to the control of the Czechoslovak government by the Communist Party?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have, on the basis of the published statements of the official press of the Communist Party in the United States.

6815 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 223—

Q. —which is an issue of the Daily Worker for Friday, February 27, 1948, and specifically direct your attention to an article appearing on page 3, entitled, "The Czechoslovak People Lick the Warmongers," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article at the time and since.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article fairly reflect the views of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Czechoslovak government as of that date?

A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It relates the alleged sequence of events and expresses its full approval with them in terms parallel to those in which approval was expressed by the officials and the press of the Soviet Union.

6816 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what now has been
marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.
224-3

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 224.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for April 1948, and direct your attention to an editorial commencing on page 291 entitled "The People's Victory in Czechoslovakia," and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before. A. Yes, I have read this editorial at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Czechoslovak government as of that time? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is an unsigned editorial published in the official magazine of the Communist Party of the United States.

6820 Q. Dr. Mosely, will you describe briefly the internal political situation within China for approximately the last nine months of 1945 and the beginning of 1946.

6821 THE WITNESS: During the last nine months of 1945 and the first three and a half months of 1946 the Nationalist government of China was in control of certain provinces and the administration set-up by the Chinese Communist Party was in control of certain other areas. As part of the process of receiving the surrender of the Japanese forces there developed a grace between the two forces, the two governments and the two armies, to extend their respective control over as wide areas as possible in the country. At the same time the Nationalist Government and the Chinese Communist administration, de facto administration, in these areas were conducting negotiations for the establishment of a unified government and a unified army for the entire country. At this time both the Soviet Union and the United States recognized the Chinese Nationalist Government as the legal government of China and the representative of China in all international affairs.

6822 By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to arrive at any opinion as to the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the internal political situation in China which you have just described as of that period?

A. Yes, I have, on the basis of official publications issued by the Soviet Government and by the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 225—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 225.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Which is an issue of War and the Working Class.—

MR. ABT: What is your number?

MR. LENVIN: M-75.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —for April 15, 1945, and direct your attention to an article by M. Avarin, the title "Which Way is China Going," and ask you if you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article at the time in Russian, and I have read it more recently in its English translation.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitudes of the Soviet Government toward the political situation in China as of that date?

A. Mr. Avarin has been well known as early as 1931 as an authorized and frequent commentator on Far Eastern and particularly Chinese affairs in the official Soviet Press. This journal was issued by the Council of Trade Unions in the Soviet Union.

Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. Yes, I have. Through its official publications and spokesmen, the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently throughout this period on events in China and recommended definite policies which it urged should be followed in respect to China, by the United States and other governments.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 226,—

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for September 1945, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 843, entitled "Avert Civil War in China," by Frederick V. Field, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

6824 THE WITNESS: Yes, I read this article in Political Affairs, which is the monthly magazine of the Communist Party in the United States.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, does this article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the political situation in China as of that date?

A. In my opinion it does. In analyzing the Chinese situation and problem, it gives full support to the claims and demands of the Chinese Communist Party. It paints a completely black picture of the policies and situation of the Chiang government. It supports the program followed at that time by the Chinese Communist Party. In this its recommendations and its analysis run directly parallel with those presented through the official press of the Soviet Union on the same issue and at that time.

Q. I would also like to call your attention to the issue of Political Affairs of September 1945, which has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 210, which contains the resolution of the National Committee of the Communist Party, which you have already seen, and ask you, too, whether these resolutions likewise reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the
6825 political situation in China as of that date.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I read these resolutions at the time they were first published, and I read them on several occasions since. In the section of the resolutions which deals with the situation in China and the policy which is advocated by the Communist Party with respect to Chinese developments, its resolution is parallel to the policies and recommendations advocated in the official press of the Soviet Union at that time.

6828 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 227—

Q. —which is an issue of the—

Q. The Daily Worker—for May 25, 1946, and direct your attention to an article appearing on page 2 and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It reflects the interpretation given to those events by the Communist Party of the United States, it reflects the policies which it advocated in relation to Chinese developments, and it reflects the criticism and objections to the policies which it alleged were pursued by the United States Government. In these respects it directly parallels the criticisms and recommendations expressed in the Soviet Press at the same time on this question.

6831 Q. Again referring back to that matter which the Panel has agreed to take judicial notice of, I ask, Dr. Mosely, if in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, you have been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Civil War in China and the eventual emergence of the people's government as the government in China. A. Yes, I have. Through frequent comments in the official Soviet press and the press of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Soviet spokesmen

regularly expressed full support and approval for the general policies of the Communist Party in China and welcomed each step in the growth of its military and political power. Upon the completion of the basic conquest of the Chinese mainland by the forces of the so-called people's republic, the Soviet government withdrew its recognition from the Chinese Nationalist Government, which it recognized up to then, and extended recognition to the so-called people's government, which has always stated that it is led by the Chinese Communist Party, that the Chinese Communist Party is the leading force within the so-called
6832 people's republic. The Soviet Government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union congratulated both the Government of the so-called people's republic and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party upon its victory at the beginning of October 1949.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 228—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 228.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of the Soviet Press Translations issued by the Far Eastern Institute of the University of Washington, issue for 15 February 1947, containing a translation of an article in Izvestia for December 8, 1946, by A. Perevertailo, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article shortly after it appeared, in Russian, in Izvestia in Moscow, and I later read it in translation issued under the auspices of the Soviet Press Translations of the University of Washington.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion, since it was published in Izvestia, it is an authoritative statement of the Soviet view of Chinese de-
6833 velopments. It gives full approval to the general

course followed by the Chinese Communist Party and the administration of that Party in certain provinces of China, and it places all responsibility for the failure of any efforts to unify the regime in China upon the Chinese Nationalist Party and government, although that failure was not yet a final one as far as it could be foreseen at the time.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 229—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 229.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Soviet Press Translations by the Far Eastern Institute of the University of Washington, for February 15, 1948, which contains an article from Pravda for December 6, 1947, entitled, "The Rising Struggle for National Liberation in China," by K. Yevgenyev, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article in Pravda shortly after it appeared, and I have read it in the English translation prepared by the Soviet Press Translations of the University of Washington.

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and the attitude of the Soviet Government toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. Yes, in my 6834 opinion it does. It appeared in the official organ of the Central Committee and the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik. It is a typical expression of the Soviet interpretation of the situation and the development in China, and a typical set of recommendations concerning those developments.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 230—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 230.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Soviet Press Translations for November 15, 1949, which contains the translation of an editorial from Pravda dated October 5, 1949, entitled, "The Historic Victory of the Chinese People," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read the major part of this editorial in Pravda of October 5, 1949, as transmitted by the Soviet Press agency on the following day. I read the completed editorial in Russian a few days later, and I have read the translation into English.

Q. In your opinion; Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the view and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. Yes. This is in my opinion an authoritative statement of the 6835 Soviet view and recommendations and hopes concerning the then existing situation in China. It states the official attitude of the Soviet Government toward the newly created People's Democratic Republic of China.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 231—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 231.)

MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of "For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy," for November 11, 1949, which issue contains a report delivered by G. M. Malenkov at the anniversary meeting of the Moscow Soviet November 6, 1949, and ask you whether you have ever read this report before.

A. Yes, I have. I read extensive excerpts from it on the following day reproduced in the American Press, and I read the full text in Pravda in a few days after it was published in Moscow, and I have read the English version as published in the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that report or do portions of that report fairly reflect the views and attitude

of the Soviet Union toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. In my opinion it does. This is a report delivered by a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik upon the solemnization celebrating the anniversary of the October Revolution in Russia, and this occasion is traditionally made the time of formal authoritative pronouncements by leading members of the Communist Party and of the Soviet regime.

Q. I now show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 232—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 232.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —an issue of Political Affairs for July 1946, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 602 entitled "U. S. Imperialist Intervention in China," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article fairly reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the political situation in China as of that date? A. In my opinion it does. It was published in the magazine of the Communist Party of the United States, and it is typical of other expressions of opinion on the same problem at about that time by the Communist Party of the United States.

The interpretation which it gives to events in China and the recommendations which it makes concerning policy toward those developments is directly parallel with the interpretations and recommendations as published by the official Soviet Press at about that time.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 233—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 233.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —Political Affairs for December 1948, which reprints the text of a cablegram sent on December 6, 1948, entitled "Greetings to the Glorious Communist Party of China," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this at the time and since. It is a greeting extended by the Communist Party of the United States over the signature of Mr. Foster and Mr. Dennis, "To the Victorious Fighters and Leaders of the People's Liberation Army led by the Great Communist Party of China and Helmsman, Mao Tse-tung."

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 234—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 234.)

6838

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —Daily Worker for Tuesday, October 4, 1949, and direct your attention to an article appearing on page 2 entitled "Foster-Dennis Hail New China," and ask you whether you have ever seen that before. A. Yes, I read this message as published in the Daily Worker for October 4, 1949, page 2. It is an official greeting from the National Chairman and General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States addressed to the Chairman of the People's Republic in China. It extends the congratulations of the Communist Party in the United States to the newly formed People's Republic government of China. It praises the leading role of the Chinese Communist Party in the victories which have been achieved in China.

6840

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, have you been able to arrive at any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Civil War existing in Viet Nam in the years following the cessation of hostilities in Asia? A. Yes, I have.

Q. Will you state what those views and attitudes were in your opinion? A. When large-scale guerilla fighting broke out in the summer of 1946 in Indo-China, of which Viet Nam is one part, the Soviet press expressed its full approval of the struggle waged by the so-called liberation forces and urged victory of that side in the struggle. It attacked the French in Indo-China and the Government of the French Republic for continuing to wage its war in the area. Then it declared its full sympathy and support for the so-called people's liberation forces, and later it 6841 recognized the Government of the People's Republic of Viet Nam which was then headed by Ho Chi Minh, who was described in the Soviet Press as an experienced Communist of many years' standing. It rejected the protest of the French Government made against this recognition of the People's Republic of Viet Nam by the Soviet Union.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 235—

Q. —which is an issue of New Times, No. 6, 1950, and direct your attention to an article entitled "The Soviet Union and Viet Nam," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article shortly after it was published in the Russian language edition of New Times, and I have also read it in the English language version of New Times.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the political situation existing within Viet Nam as of that date?

A. In my opinion it does. This is a typical Soviet interpretation of the events in Viet Nam, expressing full 6842 support for the so-called democratic republic of Viet Nam and its military forces and justifying the recognition of the government of Ho Chi Minh as the Government representing the entire Viet Nam people.

Q. The Chairman has stated that the Panel take judicial notice of the fact that there was guerilla warfare going on within the Philippines. Can you state the names of the opposing factions in this guerilla warfare in the Philippines?

A. In the Philippines the fighting of guerillas had been led by the organization known as Hukbalahops, commonly abbreviated Huks, and Tagalog, which means the People's Liberation Army.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 236—

Q. —which is an issue of New Times, No. 31, 1950, and direct your attention to the article entitled "The Philippine Scene," by I. Lapitsky, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article in both the Russian and English language versions of New Times. I have read this article by I. Lapitsky in both the Russian language and the English language versions of New Times which is an authoritative journal published in Moscow dealing with world affairs.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the guerilla warfare situation in the Philippines as of that date? A. This is a typical expression of the Soviet approval and support for the Huks, which has been expressed frequently since the guerilla fighting broke out in July 1946.

MR. ABT: Will you give me the date of that New Times article?

MR. LENVIN: August 2, 1950. Some of them don't carry a date.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 237—

Q. —which is Soviet Press Translations for November 1, 1948, and direct your attention to the translation of an article which appeared in Izvestia for September 12, 1948, which I. Plyshevsky wrote, entitled "The Situation in Burma," and ask you whether you have read that 6844 article before. A. Yes, I read this article in Russian in Izvestia shortly after it was published in Moscow, and I have read an English version published in Soviet Press Translations.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the political situation in Burma as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is a typical Soviet expression of views concerning the nature of the struggle in Burma, expressing its opposition to the legally recognized government of Burma and expressing full support to the Communist-led guerilla forces against both the government and other guerilla forces which are not communist-led.

Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the political situations in Indo-China, Burma, and the Philippines. A. Yes, I have, on the basis of the published statements of the spokesmen, commentators and official press of the Communist Party of the United States.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 238—

6845 Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for January 1951, and direct your attention to the main resolution of the 15th National Convention of the Commu-

nist Party, USA, entitled "Working-Class and People's Unity for Peace," and ask you whether you have ever read that before? A. Yes, I have read this main resolution of the 15th National Convention.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that resolution reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the political situation existing in Indo-China and Burma as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It expresses support for the cause of the movement of colonial liberation, and names Indo-China and Burma and the Philippines among those areas in which it supports that struggle.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 239—

.

Q. —which is Political Affairs for October 1950, and I direct your attention to page 1 which contains the main report to the plenary session of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, held on September 19 6846 and 20, 1950, entitled "The Present Situation and the Tasks of Our Party," by Gus Hall, and ask you whether you have ever read that report before. A. Yes, I have read this speech or report delivered by Mr. Hall and published in Political Affairs for October 1950.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this report reflect the attitude of the Communist Party toward the political situation in Burma and the Philippines? A. Yes. It is a highly authoritative statement of the views advocated by the Communist Party of the United States and it expresses full support for the so-called liberation movement in Burma, the Philippines, and Indo-China. In this it is directly parallel to the expressions of views published in the Soviet Press.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 240—

.